JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS MARY HAMILTON (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			DEFENDANTS RITE AID CORPORATION							
			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant <u>DELAWARE</u> (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.							
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Rahul Munshi, Esquire, C 1525 Locust Street, 9th F 215.545.7676; munshi@c	loor, Philadelphia, PA 1			Attorneys (If Known)		_				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in One	Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF PE	RINCIPA	L PARTIES				
U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State		Incorporated or Pri		PTF 4	DEF	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5 5 of Business In Another State							
				on or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation		0 6	0 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			1 90	DRFEITURE/PENALTY	PAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER	THE	P 1	
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	□ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 755 Motor Vehicle □ 1360 Other Personal hjury □ 1	NJURY PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEI icle		Case of Property 21 USC 881 Ca		422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal		OTHER STATUTES 375 False Claims Act 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antirust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information		
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	īS∞ □ 79	Leave Act 00 Other Labor Litigation 01 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application 55 Other Immigration Actions	□ 870 Taxe or D □ 871 IRS- 26 U	AL TAX SUITS s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant) —Third Party ISC 7609	Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		peal of	
Proceeding Sta	moved from ate Court 3 R	Appellate Court	Reop	(specify) Do not cite jurisdictional state	r District	6 Multidistr Litigation				
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of cau Plaintiff was discri	ise:	ecause	of her age.						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS I UNDER RULE 23	S A CLASS ACTION , F.R.Cv.P.	Į D	EMAND \$ in excess of \$1		CHECK YES only URY DEMAND		compla		
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKI	ET NUMBER _				
DATE 12/18/2015		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNE	OF BY CORD						
PER CEPTE USE ONLY	MOLINT	APPLYING IFP	- 1	JUDGE		MAG. JU	DGE			

Case 2:15-cv-06686-PD Document 1 Filed 12/18/15 Page 2 of 17

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: Ashton,PA					
Address of Defendant: 4400 Pennell Road, Aston, PA 19041					
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 4400 Pennell Road, Aston, I					
(Use Reverse Side For A	•				
Ooes this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Yes No					
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)	Yesu Nous				
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ Not.				
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:					
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:				
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:					
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year.	ear previously terminated action in this court?				
	Yes No				
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior s action in this court?	suit pending or within one year previously terminated				
	Yes□ No.				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier r					
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No ™				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil right	ts case filed by the same individual?				
. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Yes□ No.				
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in one category only)					
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:				
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts				
2. □ FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury				
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation				
4. □ Antitrust	4. Marine Personal Injury				
5. □ Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury				
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)				
7. Kiril Rights	7. Products Liability				
8. Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos				
9. Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases				
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)				
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)					
ARBITRATION CERT (Check Appropriate Co					
Ranul Munshi , counsel of record do hereby certif	y:				
□ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; □ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of				
12/19/15 WIT 1	307548				
DATE: 12/18/15 Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#				
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the					
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or	within one year previously terminated action in this court				
except as noted above.					
DATE: 12/18/15	307548				
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#				

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

MARY HAMILTON			CIVIL ACTION	
V.		:	*	
RITE AID CORPORATION			NO.	
plaintiff shall complete a C filing the complaint and ser side of this form.) In the designation, that defendant	ase Management T ve a copy on all defi event that a defen shall, with its first arties, a Case Mana	Frack Design Fendants. (So Idant does re Eappearance Eagement Tra	Reduction Plan of this court, couns nation Form in all civil cases at the ties § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the rot agree with the plaintiff regarding, submit to the clerk of court and seack Designation Form specifying the ned.	me of everse g said rve on
SELECT ONE OF THE F	FOLLOWING CA	SE MANA	GEMENT TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases	brought under 28	U.S.C. § 22	.41 through § 2255.	()
(b) Social Security – Cases and Human Services de			on of the Secretary of Health Benefits.	()
(c) Arbitration – Cases req	uired to be designa	ited for arbi	tration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involence exposure to asbestos.	ving claims for per	sonal injury	or property damage from	()
(e) Special Management – commonly referred to a the court. (See reverse management cases.)	s complex and that	t need speci	al or intense management by	()
(f) Standard Management	- Cases that do not	t fall into an	y one of the other tracks.	(x)
12/18/15	Rahul Munshi		Mary Hamilton	
Date	Attorney-at	t-law	Attorney for	
215-545-7676	215-814-8920)	munshi@consolelaw.co	om
Telephone FAX		ber	E-Mail Address	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

MARY HAMILTON

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MARY HAMILTON Aston, PA 19014

Plaintiff,

CIVIL ACTION NO.

 \mathbf{v} .

RITE AID CORPORATION 4400 Pennell Road Aston, PA 19041

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Defendant.

COMPLAINT

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff, Mary Hamilton, brings this action against her former employer, Rite Aid Corporation ("Defendant" or "Rite Aid"). Plaintiff, a long-tenured, high-performing employee of Defendant, was terminated in July 2013 within weeks of complaining to her supervisor and Human Resources ("HR") that she was being discriminated against because of her age.

Plaintiff was discriminated against because of her age in violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, as amended, 29 U.S.C. §621, et seq. ("ADEA") and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, as amended, 43 P.S. §951, et seq. ("PHRA"). Plaintiff was further retaliated against by Defendant for complaining of age discrimination in the workplace. Plaintiff seeks all damages, including economic loss, compensatory and liquidated damages, and all other relief under applicable federal and state law as this Court deems appropriate.

II. PARTIES

1. Plaintiff, Mary Hamilton, is a female individual and citizen of the Commonwealth

of Pennsylvania.

- 2. Plaintiff is currently fifty-seven (57) years old and was fifty-four (54) years old when she was terminated by Defendant.
- 3. Defendant Rite Aid Corporation is a Delaware corporation with a principal place of business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 4. Defendant is engaged in an industry affecting interstate commerce and, at all relevant times, has regularly conducted business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 5. At all times material hereto, Defendant has acted as an "employer" within the meaning of the statutes which form the basis of this matter.
- 6. At all times material hereto, Defendant employed more than twenty (20) individuals.
- 7. At all times material hereto, Defendant acted by and through its authorized agents, servants, workmen, and/or employees acting within the course and scope of their employment with Defendant and in furtherance of Defendant's business.
- 8. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was an "employee" of Defendant within the meaning of the statutes which form the basis of this matter.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 9. The causes of action which form the basis of this matter arise under the ADEA and the PHRA.
- 10. The District Court has jurisdiction over Count I (ADEA) pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §626(c) and 28 U.S.C. §1331.
- 11. The District Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Count II (PHRA) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.

- 12. Venue is proper in the District Court under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred within this District.
- 13. On or about November 21, 2013, Plaintiff filed a Charge of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"), complaining of acts of discrimination and retaliation alleged herein. This Charge was cross-filed with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission ("PHRC"). Attached hereto, incorporated herein and marked as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of the EEOC Charge of Discrimination.
- 14. On or about September 21, 2015, the EEOC issued to Plaintiff a Notice of Right to Sue (Issued Upon Request). Attached hereto, incorporated herein and marked as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of that notice.
- 15. Plaintiff has fully complied with all administrative prerequisites for the commencement of this action.

IV. <u>FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS</u>

- 16. Plaintiff was born in October 1958 and is currently fifty-seven (57) years of age.
- 17. Plaintiff commenced employment with Defendant in 2000 as a pharmacy cashier at Defendant's Aston, PA location.
- 18. From around 2008 until her termination in July 2013, Plaintiff served as a Shift Supervisor and occasionally interim acting Store Manager at the same location.
- 19. From 2000 until May 2013, Plaintiff was a dedicated, loyal employee who never received any documentation indicating that her performance was unsatisfactory.
- 20. In thirteen (13) years of employment, Plaintiff was never placed on any type of performance improvement plan and never received any written discipline regarding performance.
 - 21. Rather, Plaintiff received numerous merit-based accolades for her outstanding

performance and managerial skills.

- 22. Starting in or around May 2013, Plaintiff began reporting to Tracie Kozempel (25¹/f), who was hired as the Store Manager.
- 23. Despite her position as Senior Shift Supervisor and Acting Store Manager during several periods over numerous years, Plaintiff was not hired for the position of Store Manager when it became vacant.
- 24. Plaintiff expressed her interest in this position to the District Manager, James McWilliams, but was passed over in favor of Ms. Kozempel, a substantially younger employee of Defendant with far fewer years of experience and fewer qualifications.
- 25. At the time Ms. Kozempel became Store Manager, the Shift Supervisors at this location included:
 - a. Plaintiff (age 54);
 - b. Kenny Fornwalt (age 23); and
 - c. Bill Suter (age 26).
 - 26. Plaintiff was substantially older than every management employee at this store.
- 27. Nevertheless, upon Ms. Kozempel's hiring as Store Manager, Plaintiff looked forward to continuing to serve as Senior Shift Supervisor and working with Ms. Kozempel.
- 28. Almost immediately, however, Ms. Kozempel exhibited bias towards Plaintiff, targeted her for termination, and singled her out inappropriately because of Plaintiff's age.
- 29. By way of example, in or around May 2013, Ms. Kozempel reprimanded Plaintiff for allegedly working "too slowly."
- 30. Ms. Kozempel specifically stated to Plaintiff that "because of your age you are not as fast as the other Shift Supervisors."

¹ Ages contained herein are approximates.

- 31. At the time, Plaintiff was fifty-four (54) years of age and almost thirty (30) years older than Ms. Kozempel.
- 32. Approximately one (1) week later, Ms. Kozempel repeated her comment to Plaintiff that she was allegedly "too slow" in the presence of Mandy Rhoades, a Rite Aid Store Manager at a different location.
- 33. Plaintiff immediately expressed to Ms. Kozempel and Ms. Rhoades that she was offended by this comment.
- 34. Thereafter, in or around mid-May 2013, Plaintiff complained to Casey Long (age 27), Human Resources Representative, about Ms. Kozempel's comments and how she felt targeted by her new Store Manager because of her age.
- 35. Plaintiff engaged in protected activity by complaining to Mr. Long about age discrimination.
- 36. Upon information and belief, Mr. Long did not counsel Ms. Kozempel for the discriminatory comments. Instead, Mr. Long and Ms. Kozempel launched a campaign against Plaintiff in an effort to push Plaintiff out of her employment with Rite Aid.
- 37. Later in May 2013, Plaintiff complained to Ms. Kozempel in her office about the age-discriminatory comments that Ms. Kozempel had made to Plaintiff.
- 38. Plaintiff engaged in protected activity by complaining to Ms. Kozempel about age discrimination.
- 39. On or about June 28, 2013, Mr. Long met with Nicholas Simonetti (age 23), a Sales Representative at the Aston location and subordinate of Plaintiff.
 - 40. Mr. Long asked Mr. Simonetti about alleged store infractions by Plaintiff.
 - 41. Mr. Simonetti truthfully told Mr. Long that he felt that Ms. Kozempel was

targeting Plaintiff because of her age, that Plaintiff was being treated unfairly by Defendant, and that Plaintiff was a significantly better employee than Ms. Kozempel.

- 42. Mr. Long, however, cast aside Mr. Simonetti's appraisal and instead focused on an alleged security breach by Plaintiff.
- 43. Both Mr. Simonetti and Mr. Suter, who upon information and belief also supported Plaintiff with regard to Rite Aid's investigation, were terminated by Ms. Kozempel and Mr. Long within weeks of participating in the investigation.
- 44. Despite Mr. Simonetti's cooperation with the investigation and insistence that Plaintiff did not violate any store policy, on or about July 3, 2013, Mr. Long and Ms. Kozempel informed Plaintiff that her employment with Defendant would be terminated.
- 45. Mr. Long stated that Plaintiff breached security protocol because she supposedly allowed her daughter into the office of the store after store hours.
- 46. In reality, Plaintiff's daughter was allowed into the store **during** store hours and was **not** permitted into a non-customer area.
- 47. Defendant's time-stamped security camera footage corroborates Plaintiff's, and Mr. Simonetti's, recitation of the events.
 - 48. The alleged reason for Plaintiff's termination is pretextual.
- 49. As Plaintiff and Mr. Simonetti told Mr. Long, Ms. Kozempel targeted Plaintiff because of her age and sought to have her terminated upon her arrival as Store Manager.
- 50. Plaintiff was also singled out while Mr. Fornwalt (age 23) was never reprimanded, let alone terminated, for having his friend and former co-worker, Steve Schoell, on location after store hours and in non-customer areas of the store.
 - 51. Mr. Fornwalt has not complained of age discrimination by Defendant.

- 52. Mr. Simonetti alerted Ms. Kozempel and Mr. Long of Mr. Fornwalt's serious security infractions, but no investigation was completed and no discipline handed out.
 - 53. As a Shift Supervisor, Mr. Fornwalt is a comparator to Plaintiff.
- 54. The termination of Plaintiff's employment was discriminatory and in retaliation for Plaintiff's complaints of age discrimination.
- 55. Plaintiff's age was a motivating and/or determinative factor in Defendant's discriminatory treatment of Plaintiff and in the termination of Plaintiff.
- 56. Plaintiff engaged in protected activity by complaining of the age discrimination to which she was subjected.
- 57. Plaintiff's complaining of discrimination was a motivating and/or determinative factor in Defendant's discriminatory and retaliatory treatment of Plaintiff, and in the termination of Plaintiff's employment.
- 58. The retaliatory actions taken against Plaintiff after she complained of discriminatory conduct would have discouraged a reasonable employee from complaining of discrimination.
- 59. Defendant has failed to provide a legitimate, non-discriminatory and non-retaliatory reason for Plaintiff's termination.
- 60. As a direct and proximate result of the discriminatory and retaliatory conduct of Defendant, Plaintiff has in the past incurred, and may in the future incur, a loss of earnings and/or earning capacity, loss of benefits, pain and suffering, embarrassment, humiliation, loss of self-esteem, mental anguish, and loss of life's pleasures, the full extent of which is not known at this time.
 - 61. The conduct of Defendant, as set forth above, was willful under the

circumstances, was done by and with knowledge of upper management, and warrants the imposition of liquidated damages against Defendant.

COUNT I - ADEA

- 62. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraph 1 through 61 above, as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 63. Plaintiff's age was a substantial, motivating, and/or determinative factor in connection with Defendant's treatment of her.
- 64. Plaintiff's complaints of age discrimination was a substantial, motivating, and/or determinative factor in connection with Defendant's treatment of her.
- 65. By committing the foregoing acts of discrimination and retaliation against Plaintiff, Defendant has violated the ADEA.
 - 66. Said violations were willful and warrant the imposition of liquidated damages.
- 67. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the ADEA, Plaintiff has suffered the damages and losses set forth herein and has incurred attorneys' fees and costs.
- 68. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages as a result of Defendant's discriminatory and retaliatory acts unless and until this Court grants the relief requested herein.
 - 69. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.

COUNT II - PHRA

- 70. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 69 above, as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 71. Plaintiff's age was a substantial, motivating, and/or determinative factor in connection with Defendant's treatment of Plaintiff.

8

- 72. Plaintiff's complaints of age discrimination was a substantial, motivating, and/or determinative factor in connection with Defendant's treatment of her.
- 73. By committing the foregoing acts of discrimination and retaliation, Defendant has violated the PHRA.
- 74. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the PHRA, Plaintiff has sustained the injuries, damages, and losses set forth herein and has incurred attorneys' fees and costs.
- 75. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages as a result of Defendant's discriminatory and retaliatory acts unless and until this Court grants the relief requested herein.
 - 76. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.

RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks damages and legal and equitable relief in connection with Defendant's improper conduct, and specifically prays that this Court grant the following relief to Plaintiff by:

- (a) declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of the ADEA;
- (b) declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of the PHRA;
- (c) enjoining and permanently restraining the violations alleged herein;
- (d) entering judgment against Defendant and in favor of Plaintiff in an amount to be determined;
- (e) awarding compensatory damages to make Plaintiff whole for all lost earnings, earning capacity and benefits, past and future, which Plaintiff has suffered or may suffer as a result of Defendant's improper conduct;

9

Case 2:15-cv-06686-PD Document 1 Filed 12/18/15 Page 13 of 17

(f) awarding compensatory damages to Plaintiff for past and future pain and suffering,

emotional upset, mental anguish, humiliation, and loss of life's pleasures, which Plaintiff

has suffered or may suffer as a result of Defendant's improper conduct;

(g) awarding liquidated damages to Plaintiff under the ADEA;

(h) awarding Plaintiff such other damages as are appropriate under the ADEA and the

PHRA;

(i) awarding Plaintiff the costs of suit, expert fees and other disbursements, and reasonable

attorneys' fees; and

(j) granting such other and further relief as this Court may deem just, proper, or equitable

including other equitable and injunctive relief providing restitution for past violations and

preventing future violations.

CONSOLE LAW OFFICES LLC

Dated: December 18, 2015

Rahul Munshi

1525 Locust St., Ninth Floor

Philadelphia, PA 19102

(215) 545-7676

(215) 814-8920 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiff,

Mary Hamilton

10

Exhibit 1

EEOC Farm 5 (11/08)				
CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION	Charge P	resented To:	Agency(ies) Charge No(s):	
This form is affected by the Privacy Act of 1974. See enclosed Privacy Act Statement and other information before completing this form.		FEPA		
The state of the s	X	EEOC	530-2014-00326	
Pennsylvania Human R	Relations Comm	ission	and EEOC	
State or local A	gency, if any			
Ms. Mary Hamilton		Home Phone (Incl. Area		
			1958	
Aston, PA 19014	ite and ZIP Code			
Named is the Employer, Labor Organization, Employment Agency, Apprentices Discriminated Against Me or Others. (If more than two, list under PARTICULA)	ship Committee, or Sta	te or Local Governme	ent Agency That I Believe	
emeN		No. Employees, Members	Phone No. (Include Area Code)	
RITE AID		500 or More	(610) 494-2055	
Street Address City, Star	to and ZIP Code			
4400 Pennell Road, Aston, PA 19014				
DISCRIMINATION BASED ON (Check appropriate box(es).)		DATE(\$) DISCR	RIMINATION TOOK PLACE	
RACE COLOR SEX RELIGION	NATIONAL ORIGIN	Earliest		
		Jan. 20	13 07-03-2013	
X RETALIATION X AGE DISABILITY G	ENETIC INFORMATION			
THE PARTICULARS ARE (If additional paper is needed, attach extra shcet(s)):			CONTINUING ACTION	
In January 2000 I began working for Respondent and r	ny last nosition	was ShiA Suma	mrinos Cinas et land	
January 2013, Jun McWilliams, District Manager, wa	s aware of my	desire to fill t	the open position of	
ividiager. In or about May 2013, I complained of dis-	crimination to T	racie Kozumal	(age less than 20)	
ividuago, occause vis. Kozumei had explicitly stated an	d regularly insin	nated that my	artomana and and	
due to my age, and also because Kenneth Fornwalt (age)	less than 30) Sh	ift Cumamican -		
outers as gay and spread rumors about me. In June 20	L complained	to Casey I one	UD Diseases about	
the conduct of Mr. Fornwalt and Ms. Kozumel. On July 3	, 2013, Mr. Long	discharged me	,, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
Mr. McWilliams did not advertise the frequently open I	Manager position	n and never sel	ected me for it. Mr.	
Long discharged me because my daughter entered the str	ore near closing	time and I had	periodically worked	
off the clock. Despite the strict application of Responde discipline Jill (LNI) age less than 30). Shift Supervisor	mt's policy in m	y case, Mr. Lo	ng did not similarly	
discipline Jill (LNU, age less than 30), Shift Supervisor,	when she had he	er brother work	after hours in Store	
1112, or when Mr. Fornwalt had an ongoing romantic previously discharged employee in the store after closing	relationship wil	th a female sub	pordinate and had a	
the state of the s	ume.			
I believe I have been discriminated against in violation	of the Age Dis	crimination in	Employees A. C.	
The manufacture, because of the age (40th and broth	optod aptivities in	that Dear		
harassment, less favorable terms and conditions of employ	ment, and retalia	tory discharge	an subjected the to	
	,			
want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the State or local Agency, if any. I				
vill advise the agencies if I change my address or phone number and I will occurrent fully with them in the processing of my charge in accordance with their rocedures.	NOTARY - When naces	sary for State and Local	Agency Requirements	
declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct.	I swear or affirm that	I have read the above	charge and that it is true to	
The state of the s	the best of my knowled SIGNATURE OF COMP	1998, Intormation and	bellef.	
0 111	for the section and	IZ AON EIBZ		
Nov 21, 2013 Would smiller	SUSSORIBED AND SWI	ORN TO BEFORE ME T	HIS DATE	
Qale Charging Party Signature	.0.0. AIH	GECELP CO		
- V	<u> </u>	15명 이렇다 그로		

Exhibit 2

EEOC Form 161 (11/09)

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

DISMISSAL AND NOTICE OF RIGHTS From: To: Mary Hamilton **Philadelphia District Office** 801 Market Street **Suite 1300** Philadelphia, PA 19107 Aston, PA 19014 On behalf of person(s) aggrieved whose identity is CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §1601.7(a)) **EEOC Representative** EEOC Charge No. Telephone No. Legal Unit, 530-2014-00326 Legal Technician (215) 440-2828 THE EEOC IS CLOSING ITS FILE ON THIS CHARGE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON: The facts alleged in the charge fail to state a claim under any of the statutes enforced by the EEOC. Your allegations did not involve a disability as defined by the Americans With Disabilities Act. The Respondent employs less than the required number of employees or is not otherwise covered by the statutes. Your charge was not timely filed with EEOC; in other words, you waited too long after the date(s) of the alleged discrimination to file your charge Х The EEOC issues the following determination: Based upon its investigation, the EEOC is unable to conclude that the information obtained establishes violations of the statutes. This does not certify that the respondent is in compliance with the statutes. No finding is made as to any other issues that might be construed as having been raised by this charge. The EEOC has adopted the findings of the state or local fair employment practices agency that investigated this charge. Other (briefly state)

- NOTICE OF SUIT RIGHTS -

(See the additional information attached to this form.)

Title VII, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act, or the Age Discrimination in Employment Act: This will be the only notice of dismissal and of your right to sue that we will send you. You may file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) under federal law based on this charge in federal or state court. Your lawsuit must be filed WITHIN 90 DAYS of your receipt of this notice; or your right to sue based on this charge will be lost. (The time limit for filing suit based on a claim under state law may be different.)

Equal Pay Act (EPA): EPA suits must be filed in federal or state court within 2 years (3 years for willful violations) of the alleged EPA underpayment. This means that backpay due for any violations that occurred <u>more than 2 years (3 years)</u> before you file suit may not be collectible.

Enclosures(s)

CC:

Spencer H. Lewis, Jr., District Director

On behalf of the Commission

Rite Aid Corporation

Rahul Munshi, Esq. (for Charging Party)

Theodore A. Schroeder, Esq. (for Respondent)